

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Oluwatobi Sasore,	)	Case No. 4:24-cv-00350-DCC
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Warden Joseph,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

Petitioner, a federal prisoner proceeding pro se, is seeking habeas corpus relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), (D.S.C.), this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On March 25, 2024, Respondent filed a motion to dismiss or, in the alternative, for summary judgment. ECF No. 15. Petitioner filed responses in opposition to Respondent's motion and additional attachments. ECF Nos. 18, 20. On July 11, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that this action be dismissed as moot and that Respondent's motion be found as moot. ECF No. 21. The Magistrate Judge advised Petitioner of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences for failing to do so. Petitioner has not filed objections and the time to do so has lapsed. ECF No. 21.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” (citation omitted)).

Upon review of the Report, the record, and the applicable law, the Court finds no clear error and adopts the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. This action is **DISMISSED as MOOT** and Respondent’s motion is **FOUND as MOOT**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Donald C. Coggins, Jr.  
United States District Judge

October 30, 2024  
Spartanburg, South Carolina